REMARKS

As of the Final Office Action mailed April 12, 2005, the status of the claims is as follows.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 19, 22-25, 27, 28, 31, and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0025245 to Flickinger et al. ("Flickinger").

Claims 11, 29, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Flickinger in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0034609 to Dovolis ("Dovolis").

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Flickinger in view of U.S. Patent 6,069,941 to Byrd et al. ("Byrd").

Claims 2, 6-9, 15, and 20-21 were previously canceled.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 were previously withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim 36 has been added.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 19, 22-25, 27, 28, 31, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)

With respect to claims 1, the Final Office Action states that Flickinger discloses a method for electronic registration of assets in a registration database using E-registrar, which can be applied to online purchases and to conventional purchases. The Office Action further states that Flickinger discloses an example in which an asset created by a manufacturer is purchased from the seller using a credit card and the third party credit card company provides the asset registration database. The Office Action still further states that Flickinger discloses that during, or at the conclusion of, a transaction to purchase an asset, the seller prompts the purchaser to register the asset being purchased. The purchaser-specific data file, called an E-registrar, can be

an electronic file on a storage media that is accessible to a purchaser's computer, or could be maintained by a third party (e.g. credit card company website where purchaser creates and updates his E-registrar file via the internet), and the data on this electronic file can be extracted during the purchasing transaction, or can be extracted in a separate transaction initiated by the purchaser after the purchasing transaction.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, on page 11, line 4 to page 13, line 25 of the specification. Specifically, Applicants' amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, a computer-implemented method for automating product registration including generating at least one web page using the product registration information and the customer information transmitted to the server of the manufacturer to allow the customer to verify and update the product registration information and the customer information. The method further includes completing a product registration of the one or more products when the customer verifies and updates the product registration information and the customer information.

Flickinger teaches an automatic asset registration process that uses an electronic file called an E-registrar. The electronic file, which can be stored on a hard drive or in a smart card, for example, contains data specific to the purchaser (par. 0021, 0023). During an on-line purchase, the purchaser can register an asset being purchased by activating the E-registrar. When the E-registrar is activated, the purchaser-specific data is sent from the seller to a registration database (par. 0023). The technique allows automatic registration of a product or service (par. 0033). Flickinger also teaches that the user can perform an on-line registration by inputting the E-registrar into an on-line registration form (par. 0041 and 0042). Further, an asset purchased

from a conventional retailer can also be registered by swiping a smart card to obtain the E-registrar data, which is, in turn, provided to a credit card company (par. 0028).

In contrast, Flickinger does not teach or suggest the features recited in Applicants' independent claim 1. Specifically, Flickinger does not teach or suggest a computer-implemented method for automating product registration including generating at least one web page using the product registration information and the customer information transmitted to the server of the manufacturer to allow the customer to verify and update the product registration information and the customer information. The method further includes completing a product registration of the one or more products when the customer verifies and updates the product registration information and the customer information.

Instead, Flickinger teaches that the product registration is completed once the E-registrar information is provided to the on-line retailer or credit card company. There is no opportunity for the customer to verify the product registration information and the customer information. Further, there no mention of verifying, or a verification feature anywhere in Flickinger. However, this feature is taught in Applicants' Fig. 8, for example. Specifically, a product registration web page allows the customer to verify and update/modify product registration information if errors exist in the product registration information or if one or more of the products are gifts (specification, page 13, lines 6-10). If the purchased product is a gift, the product should be registered to the person who received the gift, not the person who purchased it. This feature is recited in claim 11, for example, and also not taught by Flickinger.

Further, the only update feature taught in Flickinger (see paragraphs 0020, 0021, and 0062) must be initiated by the customer. The customer must choose to log in to the manufactures website and edit his/her information. This update feature is in no way linked to the completion

of the registration process. In contrast, Applicants' invention provides an update opportunity during the verification stage of the registration process. (See Fig. 6; page 11, line 28 to page 12, line 6; and page 13, lines 8-13).

Independent claims 19, 31, and 33 have been amended to recite similar features as independent claim 1, and therefore are patentably distinct over Flickinger for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1. Claims 3-5, 10, 22-25, 27, 28, and 34-35, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 19, 31, and 33, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore patentably distinct over Flickinger for at least those reasons provided for claims 1, 19, 31, and 33.

Rejection of Claims 11, 29, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

Flickinger has been previously discussed and does not teach or suggest the invention recited in the independent claims 1, 19, and 31.

Dovolis teaches an asset managing system that provides an asset transfer feature that allows a consumer to transfer warranty information when an asset is also transferred some time after the asset is purchased (par. 0064 and 0065). In particular, at paragraph 0065, Dovolis states: "However, when assets are transferred (i.e. given as gifts, sold, transferred as part of the sale of a home, etc.), the warranty information should be transferred as well." Thus, the giving of a gift is not separately recognized, and the customer consequently does not have the ability to indicate that a product is a gift to a donee. Such information could be important for marketing purposes, for instance.

Dovolis does not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, Dovolis does not teach or suggest a computer-implemented method for automating

product registration including generating at least one web page using the product registration information and the customer information transmitted to the server of the manufacturer to allow the customer to verify and update the product registration information and the customer information, and completing a product registration of the one or more products when the customer verifies and updates the product registration information and the customer information.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Flickinger and Dovolis, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1 as each of these references fails at least to teach or suggest a computer-implemented method for automating product registration including generating at least one web page using the product registration information and the customer information transmitted to the server of the manufacturer to allow the customer to verify and update the product registration information and the customer information, and completing a product registration of the one or more products when the customer verifies and updates the product registration information and the customer information.

Independent claim 19 and 31 recited similar recite features as claim 1, and therefore are patentably distinct over Flickinger and Dovolis for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1.

Claims 11, 29, 30, and 32, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 19, and 31, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore patentably distinct over Flickinger in view of Dovolis for at least those reasons provided for claims 1, 19, and 31.

Rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

Flickinger has been previously discussed and does not teach or suggest the invention recited in the independent claim 19.

Byrd is concerned with a different technical problem than that addressed by Flickinger. In particular, Byrd teaches a method for controlling subscriber access to a fee-based service such as telephone support for computer software (col. 1, lines 11-16). Byrd therefore is not concerned whatsoever with the automatic asset registration scheme of Flickinger, which uses an E-registrar data file to register assets. Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the proposed combination is motivated by the desire to provide consumers an alternative option to contact the manufacturer's server, this motivation is not based on any disclosure in the references themselves and is therefore improper. Moreover, the system taught by Flickinger relies on a data file for automating registration and is therefore incompatible with a voice response unit that facilitates the completion of a product registration by telephone.

Byrd does not teach or suggest the invention recited in Applicants' independent claim 19. Specifically, Byrd does not teach or suggest a computerized system for automating product registration wherein the server associated with the manufacturer allows the customer to verify and update the product registration information and the customer information, and wherein the server associated with the manufacturer completes a product registration of the one or more products when the customer verifies and updates the product registration information and the customer information.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Flickinger and Byrd, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 19 as each of these references fails at least to teach or suggest

Claim 26, which depends directly from the independent claim 19, incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 19 and is therefore patentably distinct over Flickinger in view of Byrd for at least those reasons provided for claim 19.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF/RH/kd

G:\Ibm\105\14031\amend\14031.am4.doc